PB-230 683

POLLUTION OF THE CONNECTICUT RIVER. PROCEEDINGS OF WORKSHOP HELD AT HIGH POINT MOTOR INN, CHICOPEE, MASSACHUSETTS, ON OCTOBER 20, 1967

Federal Water Pollution Control
Administration
Washington, D. C.

20 October 1967

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield Va. 22151

PB 230 683

WORKSHOP ON POLLUTION
of the
CONNECTICUT RIVER
High Point Motor Inn
Chicopee, Massachusetts

October 20, 1967

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U S Department of Commerce
Springfield VA 22151

WORKSHOP ON POLLUTION

of the

CONNECTICUT RIVER

High Point Motor Inn

Chicopee, Massachusetts

October 20, 1967

1:15 P. M.

PRESIDING:

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY
United States Senator
State of Massachusetts

PANEL:

MR. MURRAY STEIN
Assistant Commissioner for Enforcement
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

MR. LESTER M. KLASHMAN
Regional Director, Northeast Region
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration
Department of the Interior
Boston, Massachusetts

MR. LEO MORRIS
Director of Public Facilities Grants
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D. C.

MR. THOMAS McMAHON
Director, Division of Water Pollution Control
Department of Natural Resources
State of Massachusetts

MR. ALFRED E. PELOQUIN
Executive Secretary
New England Interstate Water Pollution
Control Commission
Boston, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE:

MARK ABELSON
Regional Coordinator
Department of the Interior
Boston, Massachusetts

DEAN ADRIAN
Associate Professor of Civil Engineering
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

MRS. SHIRLEY B. AITCHESON
Secretary-Treasurer
East Longmeadow Conservation Commission
East Longmeadow, Massachusetts

JON E. ALLEN
Student, University of Massachusetts
Greenfield, Massachusetts

ROGER C. ALLEN
Superintendent
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department
Holyoke, Massachusetts

FRANK E. ANTONUCCI
Conservation Planner
Springfield, Massachusetts

ALAN ASIKAINEN
Graduate Student, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

RALPH L. ATKINS
Administrative Assistant to the Mayor
Springfield, Massachusetts

PAUL A. BANNICK
Sales Manager
Camp Chemical Company
West Springfield, Massachusetts

EDWARD J. BAYON
Assistant Chief Engineer
Tighe & Bond
Holyoke, Massachusetts

JACQUES BEAULIEU
Junior Civil Engineer
Agawam, Massachusetts

BERNARD B. BERGER
Director, Water Resources Research Center
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

WALTER E. BICKFORD
Student, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

ADRIEN C. BLAIS
Pollution Chairman
Council of Sportsmens Clubs of Hampden County
Chicopee, Massachusetts

MRS. ADRIEN C. BLAIS
Chicopee, Massachusetts

STUART P. BOWEN
Process Engineer
Monsanto Company
Springfield, Massachusetts

JAMES J. BOWLER
State Representative - Ward 2
5th Hampden District
Springfield, Massachusetts

LARRY BRIERE
Chicopee Conservation Commissioner
Willimansett, Massachusetts

PHELPS BROWN
President, Southworth Company
West Springfield, Massachusetts

DAVID BUTLER
Plant Engineer, Texon, Inc.
South Hadley Falls, Massachusetts

JEAN CALDWELL
Reporter, The Boston Globe
Boston, Massachusetts

STANLEY S. CEMBURA
Selectman, Town of Ware
Ware, Massachusetts

JOHN G. CLARK
Representative, Easthampton & 3rd Hampshire District
Easthampton, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

JOSEPH J. CLARK, JR.
Assistant Chief Engineer
Holyoke Water Power Company
Holyoke, Massachusetts

NORMAN A. CLARKE
President, Columbia Manufacturing Company
Westfield, Massachusetts

CHARLES B. CONLIN
Soil Conservationist
U. S. Department of Agriculture
West Springfield, Massachusetts

RICHARD H. DEMERS
Mayor, City of Chicopee
Chicopee, Massachusetts

MAURICE A. DONAHUE
President, Massachusetts Senate
Holyoke, Massachusetts

WILLIAM P. DORVAL
Postmaster
Chicopee, Massachusetts

H. L. DRAKE
Assistant to President
Stevens Paper Mills, Inc.
Westfield, Massachusetts

WAYNE R. DUBOIS
Editorial Staff Reporter
Springfield Union
Springfield, Massachusetts

SIDNEY EDELBERG
General Manager
Springfield Herald
Springfield, Massachusetts

RICHARD D. ELLIOTT
Corresponding Secretary
Conservation Commission
Monson, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

TOM H. FENG
Professor of Civil Engineering
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

JOHN A. FIELDING
Engineer, Uniroyal, Inc.
Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts

WILLIAM M. FINNEGAN
Selectman
East Longmeadow, Massachusetts

MRS. BERNARD H. FLOOD
Director, Water Resources
League of Women Voters
Lenox, Massachusetts

E. R. FOSTER
Executive Director
Connecticut River Watershed Council
Greenfield, Massachusetts

THOMAS A. FURTEK
Candidate - Alderman at Large
Chicopee, Massachusetts

RENE A. GIARD
Town Accountant
Ware, Massachusetts

GEORGE R. GIUSTI
Manager, Engineering & Maintenance
Uniroyal Corporation
Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts

EDMUND J. GLEASON
President, Springfield Chapter
Izaak Walton League
Feeding Hills, Massachusetts

ROLAND W. GRAVEL
Ware, Massachusetts

JAMES L. GRIMALDI
State Representative
Springfield, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

G. W. HAMILTON
Manager, Site & Services
Monsanto Company
Springfield, Massachusetts

MALCOLM B. HARDING
Vice President - Manufacturing
Columbia Manufacturing Company
Westfield, Massachusetts

RICHARD J. HARRINGTON
Assistant Engineer, City Engineering Office
Holyoke, Massachusetts

DANIEL HICKEY
Project Director
Springfield Area Development Corporation
Springfield, Massachusetts

THOMAS F. HONAN
City Engineer
Holyoke, Massachusetts

IRVING HOWARDS
Director, Bureau of Government Research
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

WYLIE C. HUBBARD
Superintendent of Streets & Engineering
Springfield, Massachusetts

ROBIE HUBLEY
Director, Arcadia Sanctuary
Massachusetts Audubon Society
Easthampton, Massachusetts

TOM JENNINGS
Student, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

E. C. KALLMEYER
Chief Engineer
Brown Company - Eagle A Paper Mills
Holyoke, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

PETER KARALEKAS, JR.
Graduate Student, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

WALTER T. KERR
State Representative, 11th Hampden District
Feeding Hills, Massachusetts

F. H. KING
Manager, Holyoke Gas & Electric Department
Holyoke, Massachusetts

F. W. KITTRELL
Acting Chief
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration
Department of the Interior
Cincinnati, Ohio

JOHN KNAPP
General Superintendent, Texon, Inc.
Russell, Massachusetts

LAWRENCE N. KUZMINSKI
Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

THOMAS A. LARAMEE
Superintendent of Streets
Chicopee, Massachusetts

GEORGE LABOMBARD
Izaak Walton League
Southwick, Massachusetts

RICHARD LeBOEUF
Izaak Walton League
Ludlow, Massachusetts

PHILIP A. LUTIN
Research Associate
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

NORMAN K. MacLEOD
Chairman Selectmen
Amherst, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd):

JAMES A. MADDEN
Manager, Area & Economic Development
JCA - Chamber of Commerce
Springfield, Massachusetts

LEO "BUDDY" MARCEAU
Izaak Walton League of America
West Springfield, Massachusetts

HENRY R. MASON, JR.
Administrative Assistant to Mayor
Chicopee, Massachusetts

ALEXANDER MATZ
President, Matz Corporation
Springfield, Massachusetts

JOHN D. McDONALD
Consulting Engineer
Springfield, Massachusetts

GEORGE H. McDONNELL
Consulting Engineer, Tighe & Bond, Inc.
Holyoke, Massachusetts

ALFRED A. MELIEN, JR.
Town Engineer & Superintendent of Public Works
East Longmeadow, Massachusetts

JULIUS MELTZER
Chairman, Connecticut River Industrial Committee
Springfield, Massachusetts

F. STANLEY MIKELK
Chairman, Hardwick Board of Selectment
Gilbertville, Massachusetts

JAMES F. HILLANE
Public Relations, Holyoke Gas & Electric Company
Holyoke, Massachusetts

ROBERT G. MOBERLY
Vice President, Piel Bros., Inc.
Willimansett, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

SHEILA M. MULLANE
Reporter, Holyoke Transcript
Holyoke, Massachusetts

KRZYSZTOF M. MUNNICH
Planning Director
Lower Pioneer Valley Regional Planning Commission
West Springfield, Massachusetts

JOHN H. NEBIKER
Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

ALBERT E. NICHOLS
President, Albert E. Nichols & Associates, Inc.
Feeding Hills, Massachusetts

JAMES D. NOLAN
Acting Deputy Superintendent of Sewers
Springfield, Massachusetts

WALTER J. O'CONNOR
Agawam-Springfield Seaplane Base
Agawam, Massachusetts

HERBERT R. PAHREN
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration
Boston, Massachusetts

VASIL J. PAPPAS
General Manager, Thal Dyeing Company
Indian Orchard, Massachusetts

MRS. ANNETTE PATRIE
National Anti-Litter Committee
Izaak Walton League
Ludlow, Massachusetts

ALFRED M. PEZZINI
Izaak Walcon League
Westfield, Massachusetts

JAMES F. RAMSEY
Selectman, Town of Easthampton
Easthampton, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

DONALD RAY
Graduate Student, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

R. L. REA
Chief Engineer, Stevens Paper Mills, Inc.
Westfield, Massachusetts

DONALD A. ROBB
Superintendent of Public Works
Longmeadow, Massachusetts

CHARLES N. RYAN
Mayor, City of Springfield
Springfield, Massachusetts

ABRAHAM SALTMAN
Chairman, Holyoke Gas & Electric Commission
Holyoke, Massachusetts

JOHN J. SAVIOLI
Assistant Town Engineer
Agawam, Massachusetts

PHILIP W. SHERIDAN
Assistant Chief Engineer, Tighe & Bond
Holyoke, Massachusetts

JOHN P. SIMON
Assistant Plant Manager
Springfield Rendering Company
Chicopee, Massachusetts

ROLF T. SKRINDE
Professor of Civil Engineering
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

JOHN J. SLATTERY
General Superintendent
Department of Public Works
Holyoke, Massachusetts

R. A. SOLANDER
Engineer/Surveyor
South Hadley, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

WESLEY STICKEL
Vice President - Production
Texon, Inc.
South Hadley, Massachusetts

JOHN P. STONE
Town Engineer
Agawam, Massachusetts

MRS. FRANK SWEENEY
Conservation Commission
Monson, Massachusetts

JOSEPH HILL TORRAS
President Premoid Corporation
West Springfield, Massachusetts

ALLEN L. TORREY
Town Manager
Amherst, Massachusetts

RICHARD A. WAITE
Executive Director
Westfield River Watershed Association
Huntington, Massachusetts

HARRIS WARE
Executive Vice President, Premoid Corporation
West Springfield, Massachusetts

KENNETH H. WARREN
Izaak Walton League of America
West Springfield, Massachusetts

FRANCIS J. WEINK
Superintendent, Stvens Paper Mills, Inc.
Westfield, Massachusetts

ISAAC C. WILBERT
Engineering Specialist
Springfield, Massachusetts

BEMIS P. WOOD
Vice President, Strathmore Paper Company
West Springfield, Massachusetts

MITCHELL J. ZIENCINA
Massachusetts Department ofCommerce & Development
Boston, Massachusetts

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (Cont'd.):

MR. DUN GIFFORD
Legislative Assistant
Office of Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts
Washington, D. C.

COLONEL BENTON FIELDER, JR.
Deputy Commander, Civil Engineering
Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts

COLONEL PAUL M. COVELL
Director of Information
8th Air Force
Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts

HON. PHILIP K. KIMBALL
Representative, 8th Hampden District
Springfield, Massachusetts

MR. CHARLES KIRKPATRICK
Resident Manager
Brown Paper Company
Holyoke, Massachusetts

MR. S. PETERSON
Construction Grants Program
Northeast Region
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration
Department of the Interior

MR. THOMAS RILEY
Superintendent in Chicopee
Chicopee, Massachusetts

MR. ANTHONY J. SCOLINO
Former Mayor of Chicopee
Chicopee, Massachusetts

COLONEL RAY J. SOUSLEY
Base Commander
Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts

MR. RAYMOND WADE
Base Civil Engineer
Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts

P R O C E E D I N G S

SENATOR KENNEDY: Ladies and Gentlemen:

First of all, I want to welcome everyone here today, and to thank all of you who are here for coming.

The importance of the subject matter -- the pollution of the Connecticut River, the major natural feature of Western Massachusetts -- deserves the full attention of all of us, whether we be elected officials, appointed officials, representatives of industries, or private citizens. The voices of each must be heard, and I think this workshop provides a unique forum for close consideration of the views and particular problems each represents.

Last month, the Department of the Interior convened a conference in Hartford, Connecticut, under the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act. This conference was a required step in the process of enforcing water quality standards, and its purpose was to inquire into the reasons for the delays in meeting the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior.

It was my privilege to testify at that conference, and I know that I spoke for all the residents of Western Massachusetts when I urged those who are presently polluting the River to do all they can to stop, and stop as soon as possible. The Report prepared by the Federal Water Pollution

Control Administration lists those who are polluting the River, and it also lists those who are not in compliance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior for timetables and actions to halt and to reduce the pollution. This function of the conference -- that of subjecting the polluters to the scrutiny of public attention -- is a very important one, as the subsequent outcry has proved. And it is this outcry which prompted me to call this workshop today, bringing together those responsible for setting and enforcing pollution standards and those who are listed as still polluting the River.

The officials here today are well-equipped to answer any questions posed, and I want to introduce them:

First of all, Mr. Murray Stein, who is the Commissioner for Enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration;

Second, Lester Klashman, who is the Regional Director in Boston of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration;

Herbert Pahren, who is the Director of Technical Programs of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration;

Leo Morris, who is the Director of Public Facilities Grants in Washington, Department of Housing and

Urban Development;

Thomas McMahon, who is the Director of Water Pollution Control, Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources; and

Alfred Peloquin, who is the Executive Secretary of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission.

These gentlemen can, I think, do much to help us reach the goal of a clean Connecticut faster than we would without their assistance and their advice.

This morning I participated in a ground-breaking ceremony for a sewage treatment plant in Chicopee. This visible evidence of the progress we are making is heartening.

I also had the opportunity this morning to see the Chicopee River at first hand once again, and I can report that we have a long way to go before that River is clean. And we can only get the job done if everyone involved in the necessary effort does his part.

We in Congress have, in the last few years, done a great deal to help the States, cities and towns with their task. The Water Quality Act of 1965, the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, the HUD Water and Sewer Program -- all of these have been responses of the Congress to the

pressing need to get the job done.

And when the appropriations for these programs are presented to the Congress, it has always responded positively. In the Water and Sewer Program, for example, the Administration requested $100 million, against a backlog of $1 billion. The Senate recommended an appropriation of $165 million, or $65 million more than the Administration requested. Similarly, for the construction grant program of the Water Pollution Control Administration, the Senate raised the Administration's request from $203 million to $225 million.

Further, last year's legislation raised the Federal share of the cost to 55 per cent, under certain specified conditions. These actions, I think, reflect the desire of the Senate and the Congress as a whole to help municipalities meet their pollution problems.

What I am hopeful will result from today's workshop, and from the discussions it can generate, is a determined effort by all those who are listed as polluters to do something positive about it.

Then, and only then, will the Connecticut River be a clean River, and one of which we can be proud.

Let me just say that I hope as the result of this conference, that at least those who have some questions

in their minds as to the kinds of procedures they should be following, whether it is industries or whether it is communities and towns, will have responses from these gentlemen who bear the prime responsibility, both on the Federal and State levels, of enforcing these procedures, and they will be able to respond to any of the questions and be able to spell out the course of action which is necessary for such compliance. I hope that will certainly be the result, or one of the results, of this meeting.

Secondly, I would hope that any of the particular companies or communities that have applications in now that have been stalled, or where they do not feel they have been given fair treatment, will raise those questions as well, so that those responsible will know about it and, once again, I will be reminded about it, and we can leave this meeting, myself as well as my staff -- Dun Gifford, who is up from Washington, and Jim King, who is in my office in Boston -- so that we can be of every kind of help and service to you.

Thirdly, I would hope that those who do not have an interest in trying to help and assist will at least be able to express their reservations or reasons why they cannot.

I am also hopeful, as a result of this meeting,

that those who do have other useful and constructive ideas as to what can be done to provide additional encouragement can make them known now, or that they will be able to be in contact with me to find ways that we can do it.

We have considered as well the various utilizations of tax credits and tax deductions and incentives. It has been thought about in the State; it has been thought about on the Federal level. Those of you who have given this a good deal of thought ought to make these recommendations known, and we will welcome that.

There might very well be a vehicle by which we could have action with regard to the tax credits through this session. If the President's tax bill comes out of the House of Representatives and comes over to the Senate, that could be an appropriate vehicle by which we could add perhaps some things to that which might be an additional incentive.

So I hope that those who have particular useful and constructive ideas can make some comment on that, or, if you do not want to make some comment on that today, please feel free to contact me, and we can work out at least some kind of development, because we are interested in seeing what can be usefully done.

I see a number of mayors of a number of the communities in the western part of the State which border

on the Connecticut and the Chicopee and Westfield Rivers. I see members of the Legislature who are here as well, members of the Senate who are here. I see the Chairmen of the Boards of Selectmen, County Commissioners. There is a whole host of community leaders here. I see presidents of companies and corporations who have done a great deal in this and assumed a great deal of the burden and the responsibility of providing initiative in meeting these responsibilities.

What we hope to do in the time that is available here, so that we have some idea, is that from now up to a quarter of 3:00, for an hour and 15 minutes, to have questions directed towards these respective individuals from any of the mayors or the presidents of the companies, or any of the members or Chairmen of the Boards of Selectmen, or those who are interested, so we can get at least a dialogue going.

We hope that the questions that come up will be of general interest, but if you have a specific problem, we want you to raise those questions as well.

We don't want anyone to feel inhibited about these questions. These men are on target, and we hope that you will take careful aim.

Isn't that right, Murray?

MR. STEIN: Yes.

SENATOR KENNEDY: And then, at a quarter of 3:00, we are going to talk to the Westover Air Base about their problem.

Later on in the afternoon, at 3:15 or so, we are going to have the workshop on water pollution control, and have some comments from a number of the different groups that have indicated an interest in these programs and are supporting these programs, relating their ideas and any useful comments that can be made by them.

We will try to generally follow that approach for the course of the afternoon.

I know there are a number of people here who will have to leave. We are planning to spend through the afternoon here, and I hope to learn, as I am sure all of us will, from the experience of many of the communities and towns, as well as from the industries themselves.

We will try and follow that format. These gentlemen have to be out of here at a quarter of 5:00, so we do have a little over three hours in which we can at least, we hope, provide for a useful and constructive session.

If any of you have to leave during that period of time, we understand that, and understand it completely. We might take a very brief four or five minute recess halfway

through the course of the afternoon.

So, having made just those very preliminary remarks, what we would like to do is as the respective mayors here if they would be kind enough just to identify themselves here. I think that might be helpful.

I see Mayor Demers of Chicopee here.

MAYOR DEMERS: Right here.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I can't spot everyone here. I see Mayor Ryan in the back.

If there are any other mayors here, would they be kind enough just to stand up and be recognized? A number of mayors had indicated they were going to come by. If there are any other mayors, we would like to recognize them, if we can, during the course of the afternoon.

Are any of the Chairmen of the Boards of Selectmen who are here representing their communities, or any members of the Boards of Selectmen who are representing their boards? If they would like to be identified, we would welcome that.

We have a number of representatives of industries who are here. There are a good many of them. Perhaps, rather than going down the list, I would hope that in the development of the questions they would identify themselves by name, and we will proceed in that way.

I see Senate President Donahue here. Are there any other members of the State Senate who were kind enough to come? I can't see all the way through the smoke and the light, so just sing out your names.

There are members of the Great and General Court. Some had been over earlier down in Chicopee and were there this morning, and we would welcome them.

MR. KIMBALL: Representative Kimball from Springfield.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

These will serve as my opening remarks.

I will ask Mr. Stein if he would be kind enough to just come up and perhaps make some very preliminary remarks, and then we will get on to the business of the meeting.

MR. STEIN: Thank you. Senator Kennedy and friends:

I think the situation here presents itself in a very simple fashion.

First, the Connecticut River is the largest river in New England. It is one of the most important rivers in the United States. If you dealt throughout the country with water pollution control problems as I have, and you dealt with the southwest or the arid States out west, you

would realize how lucky you are and how the people out there would just wish they had a volume of water and a stream and a river like the Connecticut River flowing by their door. Perhaps because we have had it here, we have abused it so much.

I do think that this is one of the natural resource assets that the country must use. It is a resource that your region must use if you are going to be great. I think you have to be necessarily in this area water-oriented, and the Connecticut River is that place of orientation.

I also think, as some of you may have heard at the dedication of the Chicopee Sewage Treatment Plant this morning, that this will involve Federal, State and local participation. This business of conceptualism, of local versus State, of State versus Federal, or State or Federal rights, has no place in water pollution control or water resource development.

The job is big enough for all of us to do. We all have to work at it. If we do not, we are going to fail. And I think we have to find methods where all the Federal, State and local agencies can work together.

We are particularly fortunate with Senator Kennedy, who is acting as the catalyst and sort of coordinator in this drive, because he is in a peculiar position in

our democratic society of representing or being able to be in touch with Federal, State and local people, and I think we are very fortunate that he has an abiding interest in the water resource problem in Massachusetts, and in taking time to do his painstaking homework and deal with the details of the problem, because this is what must be done if we are going to solve it.

I should point out that under the Federal law, while we are talking about Federal, State and local responsibility, we are charged in the Federal Government with cleaning up the Connecticut River. We welcome everyone's support, and I think we need it, but Congress has given us that charge, and, gentlemen, we must do it as our statutory obligation in the Federal Government.

If we are going to talk in terms of expansion of population and industry in this area, the essential prerequisite of that is a clean Connecticut River. We have found over and over again throughout the country that where pollution problems are solved, we have had a tremendous expansion of new industry coming in. There are various reasons for this:

First, if you do have a pollution problem, very few industries like to buy into a lawsuit or a problem.

Secondly, the judgment on where industry moves

is largely made, at least in the preliminary stage, by middle management. This middle management has to move there too and bring up their families. Water recreation being what it is, the most wonderful asset you can have to attract these people is a clean stream.

We have found that Sioux City, Iowa, which had not grown since the 1920's, after putting in a waste treatment plant got an award as the All America City and attracted between a dozen and twenty new industries and had their existing industries expand.

This can happen here. I think you need a clean river to do it.

I would suggest, at least from the Federal point of view, that you may want to ask all questions, including technical questions, and we consider this river so important that we have brought the national Chief of our scientific investigatory program, Mr. F. W. Kittrell, here too, who will be able to answer them.

Also, in this area, I think we have an advantage. George Orwell, the man who wrote "1984," in an earlier novel said, "Blessed are those with identifiable diseases." I think this is our situation in the Connecticut River. We don't have exotic questions. We don't have wastes where, given all the money in the world, we don't know how to handle

them. We know how to handle each and every waste going into the Connecticut River, or, for all practical purposes, we do. We can clean up this river.

The panel here, and I know them all for years, consists of professionals who have been working in this field for well over a quarter of a century, some of them, has and our staffs have given the Connecticut River considerable study. We do know the water quality that can be expected in the river. We do know what has to be done to clean up this river.

Unfortunately, when we say that, this boils down to nuts and bolts. Our experience has shown, and I think the State and interstate agencies go along with it, that there is no shortcut for cleaning up a river. We must take this outfall by outfall, examining the strength and the volume of the wastes, decide specifically on the type of treatment needed, and a time schedule for this to be done, so that we can see and you can see if we are doing the job.

In the Connecticut River this has been done. We have standards, we have a treatment program, we have a time schedule, we hope we can all work together to achieve it, and I am sure when we do achieve it, you will have a natural resource able to support a maximum number of water uses.

Thank you.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Would you gentlemen like to make any preliminary remarks?

MR. KLASHMAN: I think we would like to get into the questions.

SENATOR KENNEDY: All right, gentlemen.

MR. KIMBALL: I am Representative Philip K. Kimball of the 8th Hampden District, Springfield.

I am very proud, Senator, to have you bring this meeting and workshop here, because I think there are a lot of things that the citizens of Western Massachusetts would like clarified.

We who have been members of the Legislature, and myself especially, for the past twenty years have been very interested in this problem. I am very proud that a year ago on Labor Day, Labor Day of 1966, we passed the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act, and we have a very capable administrator sitting on your panel this afternoon.

I think, Mr. Senator, that if he would bring us up to date as to the progress that has been made towards cleaning up the water, we would then have a better idea of further questions to ask.

It was our impression last year, when we passed this bill, that this was one of the finest pieces of legislation passed in the entire country, and at that time, we

who were interested in carrying the bill and interested in passing it set a time program within five years to have the Connecticut River clean. We went out on a limb and so stated publicly. Our Department of Natural Resources backed us up at that time.

Here we are a year later, and our Department of Natural Resources now tell us what progress is being made. What if anything is hampering the progress? And what is the projected timetable now for clean water in Wastern Massachusetts?

MR. McMAHON: Senator Kennedy, Representatives, other members of the Great and General Court, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As the Representative indicated, the Massachusetts Act of 1966 provided for a $150 million bond issue, and Chapter 685 transferred the basic authority for water pollution control into the Water Resources Commission of the Department of Natural Resources.

Since that time, the Division has held hearings throughout the State, has established criteria for all particular waters, and has classified all of the waters of the Commonwealth. This includes not only the interstate and coastal, but the intrastate as well.

We have developed an implementation plan. What

we mean by that is basically identifying all of the significant municipal and industrial sources of pollution, and establishing a compliance program for these industries and municipalities. The time schedule is based upon the $150 million bond issue of the State, and also that provided for in the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966. Ostensibly, this would provide to Massachusetts in the next four years some $100 million.

At the present time, there is no Federal money available. At the present time, there are also amendments to the Clean Waters Act in Massachusetts, Chapters 687 and 685, clarifying amendments, with also two additional features on a 7 per cent advancement to communities so that we can go into final planning. This is an accelerative type of clause.

A second one is a pre-financing clause, which would allow the Commonwealth to advance in the earlier years the Federal share in order that our program can move ahead quickly.

Basically, we have some $20 million worth of construction facilities that could be provided as soon as the Federal money is available and also as soon as the amendments to our act have passed.

Also, as a follow-up to our standards, we have

notified each and every polluter in the State indicating that they are in violation of standards, and have requested a letter of intent to our office indicating that they will comply with the schedule. At the present time, we have received approximately 250 replies out of 350 notices sent out, or roughly a 70 per cent average. In most cases, the industries and municipalities indicate that they will comply.

Should they indicate that they are not going to comply, then the enforcement provisions of Chapter 685 will be applicable. They would be called in for an adjudicatory hearing. After evaluating the evidence, assuming it was on the side of pollution abatement, we would issue an order, and then any violation of dates, of course, would call for court action.

That, Mr. Chairman, is approximately the status of things right now.

MR. KIMBALL: Can we get a more specific answer in this respect?

We, the citizens of Western Massachusetts, and regardless of whether we hold public office or not, have been interested in seeing that we get a clean waterway.

Great credit has to go to our United States Senator for bringing the attention of the Federal Government to who is polluting the water, and he has the courage to do

it, and he has had the courage to call this meeting.

Now, as a result of this meeting, great attention has been brought to bear, through publicity and otherwise, to our citizenry who live in this area. We are interested in knowing what is the timetable.

Is this thing going to project itself within the five years, as we proposed under the bill we passed last year, or is this going to be ten or twenty-five years? If it is going to be five years, do we have the Federal money? If not, is this something that our Senator now has to work on? Is there anything more that we Representatives have to do, or is it the Federal Government that now has to move forward?

These are the questions that I think those of us here in this workshop would like to know the answers to, so it will be the direction in which we know we have to go.

MR. McMAHON: Yes, sir. The time schedule for the Connecticut River Basin is essentially between five and six years. This varies from community to community, depending on how far they are along on planning, also the size of the projects, and also the availability of both Federal and State monies.

The key to the entire situation is, of course, money. The $150 million bond issue authorized by the

Massachusetts Legislature,if matched by what is provided for in the Clean Waters Restoration Act, will do this job in six or seven years.

But, by and large, we are talking about an expenditure of the State of $150 million, and the cost share for $150 million of State money is about $300 million in Federal money. At the present time, only $93 million has been authorized by the Federal Government, and in the very first year, the recommendations of the Administration have cut this back to approximately 50 per cent or about 45 per cent of what it really should be.

So we do have a financial problem insofar as the Federal share is concerned.

MR. KIMBALL: Is there anyone on the panel who can tell us what is projected so far as the Federal Government is concerned in allocating additional monies for this project?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Just so that we understand a bit where we are, the question came up about the Federal funds that have been available.

Last year there was $165 million appropriated. In 1967, under the Federal Water Pollution Act, there was authorized $450 million, and $225 million has been appropriated, so that there have been some funds that have been

appropriated.

There is a freeze on the funds now, which I disagree with and have real problems with.

Maybe Mr. Stein can tell us a little more about it.

MR. STEIN: We'll give you a detail on that, Senator. You know, I understand that freeze extends to our transportation too.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Right.

MR. STEIN: And I'm going to have trouble getting these boys around the country. I hate to make this announcement, for our boys haven't heard it yet. It is, in a sense, a promotion for them.

I think we have to recognize that we must put this in perspective. The Congress has authorized certain monies to be appropriated. In the Congress, as in your State Legislature, the authorization of funds does not necessarily mean the appropriation of those funds. Those go through another process.

The authorization of the funds and what that means to Massachusetts will be given to you by Mr. Klashman. Whether we get those funds appropriated from year to year, of course, depends upon the Congress and various other situations.

I would just like to call one point to your attention. If we ever had a budget which equalled the amount of all the monies that the Congress had appropriated for all programs, you would have a very, very high budget.

I think again that water pollution control, as other programs, has to take its place in the entire family of the Federal budget.

This is not a decision that we make. We, in water pollution control, and, I guess, the representative for HUD, push as hard as we can for these funds, but the President and the Bureau of the Budget, which have over-riding considerations, have to take into account the whole budget.

I would like to call on Mr. Klashman to indicate what the Congress has authorized through the years, and specifically what this will mean to Massachusetts.

MR. KLASHMAN: I would like first to introduce Stu Peterson, who is in charge of our Construction Grants Program, with whom most of you will be dealing directly on grants.

Under the authorizations if appropriated, Massachusetts for this current year, if the $225 million is appropriated, will get $5.5 million. This $450 million authorization would give them 12. For next year, if the

$700 million that is authorized comes through, it will be 19. For 1970, if the $1 billion came through, it would be $27 million, and under the 1971 authorization of 1.25, it would be 34.7.

In the Connecticut River Valley, in this enforcement area, we estimate that the constructions will amount to some $35 million. So far, in the Connecticut River, we have had some 22 projects with a total eligible cost of about $16 million. Grant funds which amounted to $4 million have been made available to the communities.

This is our status today.

MR. KIMBALL: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one thing, and then I don't want to take any more time in this meeting, but let's keep the record straight, as I said.

In Massachusetts, we have the same problem as the Federal Government. It's always financial. Yet, we saw fit through our good leadership of our Senate President of Massachusetts, Maurice Donahue, to appropriate $150 million last year, and all the Representatives, we saw to it that we had this $150 million appropriated for cleaning up the Connecticut River. That was our prime purpose.

Over the years, we have fought with the City of Chicopee, and the Mayor has done a wonderful job in getting this thing started, because the notoriety has been here that

Chicopee is polluting the Connecticut River, and when we talk of pollution, we talk of a river that we can use for recreational purposes.

Now we have appropriated our money. The question that I would like to know, be made known, and be made known crystal clear to the people of this area, is that we are looking for Federal money, and our good Senator here has taken it upon himself to champion our cause.

We need a champion. If we don't have one, this thing will get stagnant and we will fall by the wayside. I think the reason that you have such an attendance here today is because somebody has taken the bull by the horns, so to speak, and it has been our United States Senator.

I don't know in my career where our Federal officials have come into a district and said, "Here is a project we want to work on," something that is going to be beneficial to not only Western Massachusetts, but the State as a whole.

And so, if it boils down to the fact that we do have State money, that the State has done everything that it was supposed to do and has raised the money, that we are now looking for Federal monies, and if we boil it down to that point, and if we can proceed from that point, what further can we do to make sure we get these Federal monies,

I think we will have to start on this project.

MR. STEIN: I am not saying that I don't agree with everything you said, but I do think -- and this is what I said before -- we are dealing with a State-Federal-local participation. I am not saying, and I don't think it would be truthful for us to come here from the Federal Government and say that years of neglect have led up to this problem, and anyone could point a finger at anyone else. I think we have a lot to look at as to where we go from here.

Now, it seems to me the most productive thing we can do to get this river cleaned up -- and I know Senator Donahue has been in the forefront of putting forward some of the most progressive State legislation in the country, for that matter, as we were here testifying before your State Legislature on that matter -- I am suggesting this: That we look at the resources and the tools we have available now. That is, look at your State money, look at the existing Federal money, just look at the facts in the face. You know, as they say in the midwest, "Let's grab the bull by the horns and look the problem square in the face."

If we argue this question of how much Federal monies should be forthcoming, we might get into abrasive or acrimonious debate, and I don't know that that is going

to clean up the pollution.

Let's see what you have, and let's see what we have. Let's take the example of Chicopee as the first step forward. Let's put that to work now so we will have a leg up on the problem, because if we don't and if we don't use the resources immediately available, (1) this problem is going to get worse, and (2) it is going to cost a lot more, and that means State, Federal and local, the longer you wait.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Are there any of the cities or towns that would like to ask some questions now?

We want this to be a workshop meeting, and there are a number of different communities that have applications in, or there are industries that have indicated an interest, and this is our chance now to raise these questions with these officials on the Federal and State level.

There are a number of things that have been identified by both the State Department of Natural Resources and also the Department of the Interior, and we wanted to find if there are any of these communities or industries that want a clarification or want some response on these. This is really the time to do it, because this is what these gentlemen are here for.

MR. KLASHMAN: Senator, may I just make one comment?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. KLASHMAN: As of this moment, we don't have a single application from any community in the Connecticut River Valley in our office waiting to be processed for a Federal grant. There are none.

MR. RILEY: I'm Tom Riley, Superintendent in Chicopee.

Senator, you attended our ground-breaking ceremony. There are some industries that are going to have to conform to these regulations on sewage cleanup.

Now, what branch of the Federal Government has money available for these manufacturers and industries to get some money to make their surveys, the primary surveys in their factories, to get this program underway?

MR. STEIN: There are no Federal funds available for industries from us where these industries discharge, either for preliminary surveys or construction.

However, industries may join together with municipalities in a joint waste treatment plant, and these plants can treat industrial or municipal wastes, or both, and as long as the municipality owns the plant, they are eligible for the full grant. However, industries as industries are not eligible for funds.

MR. BAYON: I'm Edward Bayon of the firm of

Tighe & Bond, consulting engineers in the area here. We represent a majority of the communities here and, through these communities, many of our industries.

I would like to set forth an observation here, first of all, to see what can be done about this problem that is rapidly developing here.

There is a tremendous amount of unrest that has developed not only with the communities, but with the industries, because of our water pollution control program. I mean by this that everyone is interested. Everyone in this room is interested in a clean Connecticut River. This is not the problem.

The problem revolves around the fact that we have a very rigid enforcement law. We have a time schedule. We have the implementation schedule, as it has been called, that has been issued to every community and to every industry which is a polluter.

Now, we heard Tom McMahon say that this implementation schedule which has been forwarded to the Department of the Interior and approved by that agency is now law, and under this law it says, in effect, that if this city or if this industry does not abate its pollution by a certain date, they are in jeopardy.

We heard Tom also say that the implementation

schedule is built around a certain amount of availability of both Federal and State funds. We also know at this point that the amount of the Federal funds which was the basis for developing this implementation schedule is actually, as a matter of fact, not available.

We have a Massachusetts aid bill that Representative Kimball has spoken of, and Tom McMahon advised us that this is not workable because of a defect in the act. There is presently an amendment before our General Court to straighten this out. We hope it will be straightened out.

I think, in fairness, we should say that the City of Chicopee has taken a little risk here in starting this plant today, because they anticipate 30 per cent State grants, but unless the General Court amends our act, Chicopee will never get the 30 per cent.

Now, the point that I am making here is that there has been a philosophy set, and the philosophy basically is that all communities are entitled to 80 per cent grants. This is the basic philosophy. We all understand this.

Now, the program cannot move unless the 80 per cent grant is made available. I can see Murray shaking his head.

What I mean here, Murray, is that the Federal

grant is now up to 55 per cent, if we can meet certain criteria. We feel that we can meet the criteria. The State act provides 25 per cent. This is the 80 per cent.

Keep in mind, gentlemen, that this is the basic philosophy. Congress has said and our Massachusetts Legislature has said, "We're going to give communities 80 per cent if you clean up the river."

On the other hand, you have said, "You've got to clean up the river by a specific date."

Now, it isn't going to work unless the money is available within the time limits that have been established.

Now that I have made this long statement, I will ask a question. If the money does not become available so that our communities, cooperating with industries, can realize 80 per cent grants, will the implementation schedule be revised based on the availability of funds?

MR. KLASHMAN: Please understand that I am talking as the Regional Director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, and I am giving you my interpretation of the law. I did not write the law. I am a citizen of this country and this State, the same as you are.

The law, as I interpret it, sets up the job of our Administration coming forward with standards working with the States.

We have a compliance schedule. I do not know what will happen if the funds are not available and the schedule is not met. It would be, as I see it, my job to report these facts to our Commissioner, who in turn would report them to the Secretary, and the question would then be, as I see it, one that the courts would decide.

I see no other way out. What the courts would decide, I don't know.

MR. STEIN: I don't know that this should be a court battle, because I have never found those to be satisfactory in this field, but let me give you the situation as we view it.

I appreciate your view on the question that you think the philosophy is everyone should get 80 per cent from either State or Federal sources, and 20 per cent from local sources. Without arguing that philosophy one way or the other, I am not sure that what you say is held universally or this was the intent of the law, or that is the situation.

I do know that under certain circumstances in Massachusetts, given the optimum circumstances, a community can get up to 80 per cent. We do believe under the law that the requirements under the enforcement provisions for a cleanup are separate and apart from the grant provisions.

However, we have faced this situation before, and I ask you to just work with me through this.

Let me make this point: I think it behooves us all to use the resources available to do the job. If the resources are not available to do the job within the time schedule, we will have to face that problem.

You ask the question: Will this be revised? Let me point some specifics out to you. We have had similar situations in the Chicago area in the south end of Lake Michigan, and this is a multi-million dollar problem, whether the industries and the cities were going to meet the schedule or not.

I think what this turns on is whether the cities and industries, with their existing resources, have made a bona fide attempt to do what they could with what we had at hand.

I think we are going to be faced with one problem, if we have seen a city like Chicopee go ahead and try to do what they could with the resources at hand, and another situation where we find a community sitting on its hands and saying, "We need the 80 per cent or the full optimum maximum funding," and they haven't even got an application in our office. If you will just sit and think with me on this and put yourself in the position of the Secretary

of the Interior, when he is faced with these facts the judgment he might have might be a little different in either one of these cases.

Again, let me tell you, forget self interest. For example, we have had a community in Indiana, and I won't name the community, one of their major cities, that delayed and delayed one of these orders for putting in a waste treatment plant. When they finally built it, it cost them exactly double their original estimate.

Your prices are going up all the time. It seems to me that the best bargain you can get is to put your works in now, as Chicopee has done, where Chicopee has taken the first step and shown us the way.

MR. HUBBARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm Wylie Hubbard, Superintendent of Streets & Engineering, City of Springfield.

Now, Chicopee is applauded for moving ahead. Can we ask, how much does Chicopee anticipate they are going to receive back as part of the Federal and State grants?

MR. RILEY: I can say we expect 80 per cent.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, and every other city and town is going ahead on the same basis.

I think if all of the replies were forwarded, if you will look at them, I would think that without

exception, and I know in the City of Springfield, we said very definitely we are with you. We want to clean up the river and we will do everything we can. We will do our plans, and we will execute them, if we get the help that is stated, the 80 per cent of State and Federal funds.

I think Mr. Bayon was absolutely right in saying that it is universal that it is the opinion that everybody is moving forward based on this Federal and State participation, and I think it is leading people down a primrose path to tell them you can anticipate it, and let them get their plans and so forth and figure on moving ahead, when there is no thought right now definitely that there is going to be available funds to match these.

MR. STEIN: I think that's a fair statement.

By the way, and again you can check with the cities throughout the country, sometimes some of the people call us benign and thoughtless, but you will not get anyone working harder to get a community moving ahead with the maximum amount of money that they can possibly get under the Federal law than the people up here representing them.

If there is anything that I can do to get Chicopee some money, or Springfield some money, as long as we have a bona fide effort on their part, you are going to be assured that I can do it. No day is too short, no place

is too far, or nothing is too much for us to do this.

But I think again what we have to do, if we are going to get this program going, is to do this outfall by outfall, treatment plant by treatment plant, and to start getting these plans in and getting specifics, and to get moving.

This is the old question that we have. Mr. Klashman was just down on Broadway and saw one of those Broadway shows. Everyone comes up with a good idea for a Broadway show, but the question the producers always ask is, "Have you got the book and the music?"

The point is that if we are going to talk about a genuine bona fide effort of moving forward in pollution control, we have to come up with this book and this music, and this book and the music means plans and specifications in relatively complete detail to show that you mean business and you are ready to go ahead, and not the question of "Maybe the money won't be available, and therefore we have no piece of paper."

MR. MELTZER: Mr. Stein, how many communities in this area have requested and submitted petitions for this work? If that is what is holding it up, let's get down to some facts.

MR. KLASHMAN: I don't have a single application

in my office at this time from any community.

MR. MELTZER: Then they ought to be ashamed of themselves here.

MR. KLASHMAN: I can just tell you that I don't have any applications in my office.

MR. MELTZER: I have been working on this for 47 years.

MR. KIMBALL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I think we might hear from Leo Morris, who is the Director of Public Facilities Grants in Washington, Department of HUD.

They have money for planning grants, and I think it might be helpful to review what funds are available and how our communities go about the development of these, or can get these funds for the development of planning grants.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much, Senator Kennedy. I am the Director of the Public Facilities Division in the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington, and I might review some of the programs that we have that could assist you in achieving some pollution control in the Connecticut River.

One is called "Advances for Public Works Planning." This involves an interest free grant to a community

to actually go out and prepare the engineering designs necessary to submit to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration for a priority under their system of grants. This advance is repayable from the start of construction, when you either get your Federal grant or you get your bonding capacity, whatever system you undertake to get the construction monies.

In addition, we also have grants for basic sewer and water facilities. This is a 50 per cent of eligible cost grant to communities for the construction of water facilities of any type, storm sewer facilities or the collection part of the sewerage system.

Now, we can't give grants for the interceptor sewer that runs to the sewage treatment plant, but we can give grants for the collection system that feeds into the sewage treatment plant.

As Senator Kennedy indicated in his opening remarks, in 1966, this first year of our Act, we had $100 million. We had $100 million in 1967, and the Congress has raised that this year to $165 million.

We don't operate on a State allocation basis such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration does. We do, however, pretty much follow the same pattern of setting aside money for each State to use.

It might be of interest to you that given a free choice, in this general area here, the four projects that have been approved have all been for water, and I can understand that too, because in the last three or four years there has been a considerable drought in this area.

Getting back to the advances for public works planning, this is for any kind of a public works, but about 90 per cent of our advances go for water and sewage facilities.

Has anybody any questions on that?

MR. **BAYON:** Again, to get practical about these things, trying to have these programs is excellent. Your Advance Planning Program has been most helpful to many of our communities in this area in the past. As a matter of fact, the original plans for the Chicopee waste water treatment facilities were prepared under your Advance Planning Program.

However, in recent months, this program has broken down completely to just that there is no money to make any advances. Talking specifically now about the water pollution control program, I am aware of two applications out here in Western Massachusetts that have been on file with HUD for 18 months. The applications have been processed, are in order, but there just are no funds

available to make allocations.

So again I get back to this point: There is a basic philosophy built in here. If we tell communities or if you tell me, if I were a mayor of a city, that it is possible to get 80 per cent grants for building a treatment facility, or if, on the other hand, you tell me that I don't need to appropriate money to do my studies or to do my design work, that it can be obtained from the Federal Government, then I am very likely to look for this source of funds.

So, in my mind, if there has been any procrastination on the part of any of these communities in water pollution control, I assure you that it is tied in with the state of flux that we have lived in for many years now in this program.

Let me cite a few specific instances. Take our own City of Holyoke. Now, Holyoke built its waste water treatment plant, it went into operation two years ago, and here is the history: In 1959, Holyoke applied for a Public Law 660 grant. This is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. They were given a grant of $250,000.

Within a few months after the making of this grant, the Congress changed the benefits of this Act, so that they increased the maximum limits to $600,000. At that point, Holyoke said,"Wait a minute, boys. We're not

going to move on $250,000. We want the $600,000." They were advised that they were under contract with the Federal Government for $250,000 -- "Go ahead and build your plant."

Well, the result was that Holyoke did not move, and justly so. Holyoke did move, however, when President Kennedy's accelerated public works programs came in, when they saw an opportunity to get 50 per cent Federal grants. The Holyoke plant was built with a 50 per cent grant, and, as I said, it went into service two years ago.

Now, because Holyoke was good and moved ahead, they are being penalized. Chicopee is going to get 80 per cent, and any of the communities that held back to this time are in a position to get 80 per cent.

I am aware of the retroactive payments on the bond issue principals too that are coming, but this only applies to the principal payment the city is required to finance and pay the financing costs, so that this is not equitable for our communities, and we had well better settle down. I am talking about Congress at the Federal level, I am talking about the State Legislature, I am talking about the whole group that are involved with this thing, that we had well better settle down and let the communities know what the programs are.

I don't think we should be telling the communities

that there is money available in Mr. Morris's department to get money for preparing plans or to prepare reports, because, as a matter of fact, it is not available. They just are not making grants.

MR. MORRIS: I wouldn't say that it is not available. It is available on a limited basis.

MR. BAYON: Let me qualify it. It is not available within the time schedule that we are all faced with.

MR. MORRIS: I will say this: Yes, there is a shortage of funds. There is no question about that. We have many times more requests than we can fulfil at this present time.

However, we do feel that the water and sewer projects are basic needs, and we give first priority in processing to projects of this type.

We do have a number of applications from this area. I think we have something like 20 of them on hand right now at this minute, and they do receive prime consideration. We just can't take them all at once.

MR. BAYON: You say prime consideration, but there are at least two cases that I have been involved with now for 18 months.

I'm getting back to the point I made earlier. All of these communities sitting here and all of these

industries are under orders that involve a time schedule. Now, let's not wave in front of them any of these programs that won't fit into this time schedule. I think that we've got to get right down to the basic ground on this thing, and it's not fair for you to say that you've got a program that will help any of these communities, because I know that it won't within the time limits.

You see, there is a time involved here, and none of these communities can afford to file an application with your department for funds for a study, and then sit and wait 18 or 20 months. They've got a gun at their head on this implementation schedule. This is the problem.

MR. MORRIS: I can't help but agree with you. I think perhaps, Murray, this is something where a little closer coordination between the two departments might be called for.

Where you do have a gun to some community's head, if we know about it, it is certainly one of the things we will consider.

MR. HUBBARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate the same thing. We have gone down to HUD and we have asked them, "Can we get an advance planning grant?"

"Yes, your project is eligible, but you can figure right now it will be anywhere from 18 months to two

years."

We don't even put in the application if we are going to wait that long. We've got a time schedule. We've got to go out and hire the architects and do the work on our own.

So, on the same point, when you are talking about a small appropriation, this section of HUD, where you have a lot of bottlenecks, where you are saying you don't have any applications in another department, and the reason that you don't have them is that you haven't got the funds to help with the engineering, and this appropriation would be a relatively small appropriation to increase the amount of money that is available under the advance planning grant, so that you could take some of these, and you recognize that they are high priority projects, and if you had a 5 or 10 per cent of the total construction money put in where you need it right now, it would get this thing off dead center.

MR. MORRIS: I can't help but agree with you. I wish we did have more money.

MR. ROBB: I'm Donald Robb, Superintendent of Public Works, Longmeadow.

Senator Kennedy, my only interest is to correct a misstatement after your last conference. After that

conference, my community, Longmeadow, was listed with four or five others as polluting the Connecticut River. I merely wish to correct the record.

We have had a primary treatment plant in Longmeadow since 1957, and our community is over 90 per cent sewered into that plant. We have filed an implementation schedule with you and mean to comply to the letter. We certainly hope that we will be able to get 80 per cent grants.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Very nice. There are a number of communities that have complied: Amherst, Northhampton, Easthampton, East Longmeadow, Agawam.

I don't know whether there are any representatives of those communities who might be here, who might tell us a bit on how they went about this and the problems that they have faced. It might be of interest to all of us.

MR. MELIEN: I'm Alfred Melien, Superintendent of Public Works in East Longmeadow.

I think perhaps that you might have us confused with Longmeadow on that sheet. I think this is perhaps where the trouble is.

MR. ROBB: That's where the gripe came in.

MR. MELIEN: I think what you are doing is I think you're giving us too much credit.

MR. KLASHMAN: I would just like to clarify the record.

When the statement was made at the conference that Longmeadow was not in compliance, Longmeadow does have primary treatment, but Longmeadow was supposed to have chlorination in, and they do not have chlorination as far as our records show.

If we are wrong, then we would like to know it.

MR. ROBB: May I ask, sir, why East Longmeadow was considered and Longmeadow was not? Our feeling is that there was a little typographical error there.

MR. KLASHMAN: If we are in error, we will correct it.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Well, are we in error?

MR. KLASHMAN: Our records show that East Longmeadow had chlorination, but you don't.

MR. ROBB: We do not have chlorination.

MR. KLASHMAN: East Longmeadow does have chlorination according to our records, so we are right and you do not have it.

MR. ROBB: We do not have post-chlorination.

MR. KLASHMAN: This is why it was stated.

MR. KIMBALL: Senator, as long as we have our Director here from the Department of Natural Resources,

which is charged with seeing that the communities do conform, why can't he tell us which communities have not made application, which have not conformed, and which ones he feels are the ones that are the worst offenders now and should make their applications?

MR. McMAHON: Mr. Chairman, Representative Kimball: I do have a list of the communities and exactly what they have at this time, and their basic record as far as intending to comply with the Clean Waters Act. I will go through these in detail, if you wish.

Starting in Hatfield, they have completed preliminary plans for lagoons and obtained a site. At the present time there is a little bit of disillusion as to whether the lagoons will be satisfactory. We feel perhaps that a little higher degree of treatment may be necessary.

On Hadley, Hadley has secondary treatment at this time.

Amherst has primary treatment. They have agreed in writing to a plan of implementation to build a secondary treatment plant.

Northampton has primary, and Easthampton has primary. Northampton has voted plans for secondary. These plans are going to probably be coming in earlier than what is required, so we will have to say that they are ahead of

the compliance program.

In Easthampton, they also have primary treatment. They have voted for funds for the construction of secondary treatment facilities and for sewer extensions to serve their area.

South Hadley has primary. They will be going to secondary.

Holyoke has constructed a primary treatment plant serving roughly 60 per cent of the community, and they have completed plans and voted funds for the construction of additional interceptors.

West Springfield: This goes to the Springfield plant. They have completed an interceptor to pick up the industries. They also need additional interceptors. They have indicated to us that they will comply with the compliance schedule.

Springfield municipal is basically in compliance at this time, although they are scheduled for secondary treatment, I believe, sometime in 1970. They do need some rehabilitation work.

Agawam goes to Springfield. However, they do need some interceptor work.

SENATOR KENNEDY: On my list, you have some of these that you say are in compliance listed as non-compliance,

so what is the inconsistency now?

MR. McMAHON: I would have to look at your list.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Are you following this, Mr. Stein?

MR. STEIN: Yes.

SENATOR KENNEDY: On the list you made available to us, he has indicated some are in compliance, and you have non-compliance on this. Therefore, it seems to me that that ought to be straightened out.

MR. McMAHON: I think there is somewhat of a question here as to whether we are talking about compliance for the program where the Massachusetts standards have been approved, or the compliance based on an earlier enforcement action.

As far as the State is concerned, I think we feel that if the communities are progressing, building interceptors, and have indicated that they will go along with our compliance program, they are in compliance, and basically disregarding the earlier enforcement conference, at which time all of the conferees agreed essentially that both Connecticut and Massachusetts had good programs and endorsed the programs of these States.

Chicopee: I don't have anything to say further about Chicopee. I think we were all there this morning.

East Longmeadow has a primary plant. They are scheduled for a secondary plant.

Again, the letters of intent have come in to us, and they are roughly 85 per cent on municipalities. I didn't mention the industries. Our response so far from industries has been running about 70 per cent in this particular area.

Does this answer your question, Representative?

MR. KIMBALL: Well, the next question would be, these communities that are indicated they are in compliance, as you put it, have not made a request for Federal funds, and if they haven't made that step, then how can you say they are in compliance, if they haven't gone that far?

MR. McMAHON: May I elucidate a little bit on this? The reason that Mr. Klashman doesn't have plans in his office is that any of the plans that have come in are still in the State office, because they have to come through our office in order to get processed for a State and a Federal grant before it goes over to the Federal offices.

We have roughly either in the office applications or applications that are being prepared for some 27 communities. I can't tell you just how many would be in the Connecticut River Basin.

So that things are being held up, and are being

held up for two reasons. There is no Federal money available. At the present time, there is no State money available for the State grant. So that we do have some applications that other communities are holding back until such time as both Federal and State money is available.

MR. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I still would like to say that I think there is some misunderstanding here. The plans were approved by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, and they received 30 per cent reimbursement on all that construction, and the plant to my knowledge was in conformance until this recent edict of changing the classification of the river, and they have filed an implementation schedule stating that they will conform to your new requirements.

MR. KLASHMAN: Senator, may I answer your question first about Springfield?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. KLASHMAN: Again, as a result of the first conference on the Connecticut River, it was agreed that Springfield would have chlorination, as well as Longmeadow.

At the time of the second session, again according to our records, Springfield did not have chlorination.

If we are wrong, we would like to be corrected. Do you have chlorination at Springfield?

MR. ROBB: I'm not --

MR. KLASHMAN: No. This gentleman back here.

MR. HUBBARD: We have strictly primary treatment.

MR. KLASHMAN: But you do not chlorinate your effluent?

MR. HUBBARD: No.

MR. KLASHMAN: That is why it was stated you were not in compliance, because the results of the first conference were that you were to put in chlorination, and at the time of the second conference you did not have it, and so you were not in compliance.

That is the explanation.

MR. BAYON: Senator, if I may again --

SENATOR KENNEDY: I don't want to cut you off, but I don't know whether there are either some other communities or industries that would like to ask questions.

MR. SHERIDAN: Senator, I'm Philip Sheridan, one of the partners of Ed Bayon in the engineering firm of Tighe & Bond, and I have been asked to represent different communities which are our clients.

We are primarily interested here now in the Town of Easthampton. The Town of Easthampton has asked me to trace through for you people publicly their present

situation on sewage treatment.

They went ahead and built one of these so-called primary type treatment plants about ten years ago under a 30 per cent grant program. They realize that they will pick up an additional percentage, probably in the range of 30 per cent, of the outstanding principal payments on the bond for that plant.

But that plant is half paid for. If they had waited, if they had dragged their heels until this time now, they would be building that plant with an 80 per cent grant program.

Additionally, we are now under instructions to build in secondary treatment as an addition to the primary plant, at a major amount of money.

Now, at the last annual town meeting last spring, the Town of Easthampton appropriated a little more than $2 million for a sewer extension, a sewage treatment plant improvement program. Prior to that, the State had adopted the so-called Clean Waters Act of Massachusetts. This was in the fall of 1966.

When we went to the State agency for funds and expected to get something in the range of 80 per cent, we find that we aren't even ready to start to handle the paper work.

Finally, in mid-summer, sometime in July, we were authorized to file an application for the State and Federal funds. This application has been in your office, Tom, since about, I would say, July 20th, or something of that order.

Now, the implication is the communities are not moving, but they are stalled because of this lack of money, lack of money on the State level and on the Federal level.

Getting into generalities now, we had quite a discussion a few minutes ago on the Federal planning advances, and that is holding up the initial planning. This is necessary to get the projects off the ground at all.

But following behind that is the provision in your State Act, Tom, for a 6 or 7 per cent loan or advance to the communities for the construction plans and specifications. Again, you have many projects stalled because these funds aren't available.

We talk in terms of $150 million on the State level, but, as I understand it, there isn't one cent of that available at the moment.

Is that correct?

MR. McMAHON: This is correct.

MR. STEIN: Let me try this, because again I think you are all coming back to the same fundamental

question.

Theoretically, I don't know that I can disagree with you, because this has been the argument we have had from time immemorial on these grant programs. Leo Morris and Lester Klashman have both been in the Federal Government at least for 25 years, so they see it.

In every grant program we have had, whatever it was, they have said that the communities that have gone ahead have been penalized. What happens to the community when you start a brand new grant program that has already paid its money? And this is something we get, and every time it is raised the question comes up.

I ask you to just work with this, because I think what may be self-evident or as a result of common sense, on the basis of theory, doesn't work in fact.

It seems to me that with rapidly rising costs and granted there are limited Federal and State funds available that will be limited possibly for the foreseeable future, those communities that have moved forward are going to get the available limited Federal funds. We must acknowledge the kind of pressure we are having for a cleanup. Chicopee has moved forward and we have many communities that have gotten their 30 per cent money by doing just that.

I also think that they are going to have a leg up on getting the full 80 per cent, if you will, "reimbursement," when that becomes available. The communities that wait will not necessarily get these funds.

However, the problem is inexorable. The time schedule is with us. I don't think you people or other people can live with a river getting dirtier and dirtier all the time. You have to clean it up.

And now, with the permission of the Chairman, I would like to say one other thing, and I wouldn't like this for the record.

(There was discussion off the record.)

MR. STEIN: The question is that you have to show you are ready to move. You have to show you are ready to get these applications in.

Let me make this statement again: With prices going up, just examine your situation and see if you would not be better off moving now with the resources at hand than giving excuses and waiting for the millenium and someone to give you what you think is the optimum amount before you make your first move.

MR. KIMBALL: Mr. Stein --

MR. STEIN: Yes?

MR. KIMBALL: I would like to make a comment,

if you will.

We have talked about the cities and the towns and what they are doing in Western Massachusetts. What is industry doing to clean up the pollution of the Connecticut River? How far have they gone?

What comments do they have to make at this meeting? Is there anyone here from industry that is willing to make a statement as to what they are doing?

Can you make a comment for them?

MR. McMAHON: Yes.

MR. KIMBALL: Is there anyone here that represents industry at this meeting?

MR. McMAHON: I think we do have some industrial people here. I would yield if you wish to make a statement, sir.

MR. BROWN: I'm Phelps Brown, President of the Southworth Company in West Springfield.

It may seem trivial, because I represent a small company, but we have spent $55,000 to hook up to the West Springfield interceptor sewer, and we have been building the plant since April. We are finished.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Hear, hear.

MR. KIMBALL: Very good.

MR. McMAHON: I do have a schedule here, or a

listing of the particular industries that were involved in this original conference.

All of these industries have been notified. In most cases, they have been given similar dates to municipalities, so that if they are so geographically located and they have wastes that are amenable to mixing with the domestic system, they may tie into the domestic system. If, on the other hand, they are, shall we say, out of town somewhere, generally speaking, they would be required to go it alone.

I will run down these industries very quickly now. In South Hadley, we have Texon, Inc. We have not received any answer from them as to whether they are willing to comply with our schedule or not.

SENATOR KENNEDY: When did you contact them?

MR. McMAHON: Probably some 40, 45 days ago. We have given all of these municipalities and industries 30 days to reply as to their intentions of conforming to our particular schedule.

When we get down into Holyoke, we have five major industries: Brown Paper, Parsons Paper, Franklin Paper, Valley Paper, and Whiting & Company. Three of them intend to comply; two we have not heard from.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Which ones are complying, and which ones are not?

MR. McMAHON: The Brown Paper Company we have not received an answer from.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'm Charles Kirkpatrick, the Resident Manager of Brown Paper Company.

This is the first news I have of any such letter. What date did you address it?

MR. McMAHON: Sir, I don't have the exact date. I know it went out. Probably close to two months ago.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would you please check your office and send me a copy?

MR. McMAHON: Yes, and we will follow it up.

Franklin Paper intends to comply. Valley Paper intends to comply. Valley Paper intends to comply. Parsons Paper intends to comply. Whiting & Company, we have received no answer.

MR. KIMBALL: They closed up.

MR. McMAHON: That's why we haven't heard from them.

In West Springfield, we have Southworth Company, and they have been connected to the sewer.

Strathmore Paper Company: The sewer is now available, and they also intend to tie into the sewer.

Premoid Corporation: Again, the sewer is available, and they intend to tie into the sewer system.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Chairman, I am Bemis Wood, representing the Strathmore Paper Company.

Money has been appropriated for the expenditure in 1968.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Hear, hear.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you. In Springfield, we have Monsanto. They are presently negotiating with the City of Springfield. They intend to comply.

There are two Monsantos. One is the Shawinigan Resins Corporation. The same thing is true with Monsanto Chemical Company in Springfield.

We have not received an answer from the Indian Orchard Finishing Company.

As to the Thal Dyeing Company, I can't really tell you, because it doesn't say.

Continuing, down in Chicopee --

SENATOR KENNEDY: What about Monsanto?

MR. McMAHON: They are negotiating with the city and intend to comply.

Going down to Chicopee, we have the Springfield Rendering Company, and they intend to comply.

The Hampden-Harvard Breweries are to be connected to the municipal sewer.

The U. S. Rubber Company is the same.

In Westfield, Foster Machine Company, there has been a change of ownership, according to our records. There is now no industrial waste, and the municipal waste goes into the sewer system.

Stevens has indicated that they will comply.

Columbia Manufacturing Company, we have not heard from.

MR. CLARKE: I am Norman Clarke, President of Columbia Manufacturing Company.

Mr. McMahon, I have a letter in my possession here acknowledging our intent to comply signed by you. We answered your communication immediately. You have written us back and thanked us for answering, and were happy to see that we are going to comply, which we will.

MR. McMAHON: I apologize, sir. I thank you very much for correcting me.

That, I think, Mr. Chairman, completes it.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Mr.Klashman, do you want to make any comment, as far as the industries?

MR. KLASHMAN: No, I have no other comment, except to add one, and that is, Senator, in general we have found that here in Massachusetts the industrial community has shown an attitude that I think is very commendable, and, as a matter of fact, the Associated Industries of Massachu-

setts have won an award because of the work that they did in this regard.

We are looking forward to working with them.

MR. STEIN: I wonder, since we have so many industrial representatives here, if I may point out a feature of general water pollution control law, both here and other places, which may be of interest, and that is when a municipality or, rather, when an industry discharges wastes to a stream through its own outfall, it is responsible. Once you hook up to a municipal system and get into a municipal sewer, you have given that municipality the legal and technical responsibility for handling your wastes.

So it would also seem to me that, if at all possible, your first course should be to hook up to a municipal system. Once you do that, you don't have any more pollution problem or have to be fussing, really, with the Federal or the State people. You may have to fool with the municipalities on the adjustments for fees, but I think that's a local issue that you would much rather do.

This would put you in the same position as a home owner hooked up to a municipal system. And if anyone is going to worry about pollution control, it is the mayor and not you.

I would think that rather than going it alone,

you might consider this joint enterprise operating in getting into a municipal system.

MR. BAYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, but this is very important to our firm. We represent probably 90 per cent of the people sitting in this room.

What you are saying is fine, Murray --

MR. STEIN: Yes.

MR. BAYON: -- but I think you had better qualify it a little bit, as Tom McMahon did.

This is fine as long as these industrial wastes are amenable to the municipal treatment plant. Now, we are working hard to get this story across to industry, but industry itself needs to do something internally, and it needs to know its waste disposal problem.

MR. STEIN: I couldn't agree with you more, and I think this is the point.

Firstly, it has to be amenable to the municipal waste system. Secondly, there is an inbetween operation. You have three: (1) You can hook in directly if it is amenable or adjustments are made in the municipal plant to handle it; (2) industry can treat the wastes itself and get it out; and (3) industry might be required in some cases to have pre-treatment before they discharge into a municipal system.

All these possibilities have to be considered. This is a question of economics, and I think you have to take this up with your consulting engineers to see what's best for you and best for your processes.

MR. MELTZER: I'm Julius Meltzer.

Senator, may I just ask a question? On the 25th of this month, the Army Corps of Engineers are meeting at White House Inn, in a duplication of the effort that we are having right here.

I wonder if the Army Corps has completed and has sufficient information so that it can furnish that information to these communities and save them the money, and so they can then apply to the Federal agencies for the services, and continue or make some progress?

Here is a case in which we know that even Mr. McMahon is going to be there. Now, if this is true, what are we holding a meeting for here when they are going to hold it there?

Do they have this information? Why can't we help these communities?

MR. McMAHON: If I may answer that, I think the information that the Corps of Engineers has, probably from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration Regional Office, is some stream study information and the study of

flow regulation.

They really do not have detailed information regarding the individual municipal or industrial waste problems. This is more of a planning effort rather than, shall we say, a water pollution control implementation program.

MR. MELTZER: Mr. McMahon, they have made these reports and they carry out exactly what you are doing here.

MR. McMAHON: No, they don't.

MR. MELTZER: Wait a minute. I would suggest that some effort be made to determine how far they have gone and to see how you can dovetail in your work.

MR. McMAHON: We work very closely with the Corps of Engineers.

Again, it is a planning effort. It takes into consideration the broader aspects of water resources -- management, flow regulations, industrial water supply. I am sure you realize this as much as I do.

By and large, it really has not very much to do with what we are sitting here for. We are interested in water pollution control.

MR. ABELSON: I'm Mark Abelson. Can I answer that? I represent the Department of the Interior Coordinating Committee, which is meeting next week, and I will have to go along with what Mr. McMahon said.

We are an overall planning committee, and anything that has to do with pollution, it is just a small part of the Federal Water Pollution Control. It is probably one of 40 different agencies and State agencies that are contributing to this report.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I was just asking as a matter of clarification, and I was talking to Mr. Klashman about the compliance in a number of the industries.

As many of you know, there has been a publication that has been put out by the Department of the Interior, which reviews the various compliances of the members of the industries. We have gone down through that this afternoon, and we have heard that from the time of this publication until certainly today, there has been compliance of a number of the industries.

I think we ought to have an addendum to this. I am going to ask Mr. Stein and I am going to ask the Secretary of the Interior to make public and to make current the compliance of the various industries, so that the public has an up to date understanding of the industries and their compliance, because if there wasn't any further information, we would go on with this publication of September, and it would not be accurate with regard to the industry compliance.

From the statements here and what the response

has been, I think the industries certainly have demonstrated considerable interest in undertaking their responsibility.

MR. SCOLINO: Anthony J. Scolino is my name. I am former Mayor of Chicopee.

I want to compliment the Senator and the gentlemen that are here representing all of our governments, local, State and Federal, for having this session here.

I am perhaps the oldest living mayor that held office in Massachusetts, away back during prohibition days in 1932 and during the New Deal days when the WPA, PWA and Reforestation programs came into effect.

I think that many communities, if they have a better understanding of our Federal Government, can certainly get a lot of benefits out of it.

I am sort of semi-retired, but I take an interest in our community. I am so proud to see that this session is held here, and I want to compliment the Senator and the Mayor.

I was in office when we had WPA, PWA, and the conservation program, where they planted two million trees in this area. We had dikes built through the cooperation of engineers with Federal funds. We got many benefits in the community, and that's 35 years ago, gentlemen.

I'm glad to see you all here in Chicopee.

MR. MELIEN: I'm Alfred Melien, Superintendent of Public Works in East Longmeadow.

Mr. Senator, I would like to make one comment -- two, really -- but, Mr. McMahon, you stated that East Longmeadow was scheduled for secondary treatment, and I don't think that the full story on East Longmeadow is perhaps known to you and perhaps maybe not in the Department, although I think it should be, but you have a letter on file which I sent to you perhaps two to three weeks after we got your implementation program stating that in our opinion it would not be feasible or possible for us to actually construct secondary treatment, and that we feel that it should be a joint program between East Longmeadow and Springfield, treating the wastes such as Agawam.

There were some qualifications which I wrote in that letter, so that just for the record, I think that we would be a lot better off, and I think this is not only true with a town like Eastmeadow, but perhaps many other communities that border big cities which are polluting the river.

Secondly, and I know this doesn't affect anybody at the table necessarily, but there seem to be several representatives here, and I think that perhaps some legislation could help some communities if we had some new

legislation.

We have an application which has been approved going on two and a half years now. Our plans are made. We were all set to go. We were going to tie in with the City of Springfield sewer system at one section, which is a half million dollar sewer program, to clean up the whole northeast section of our town.

True, we are not dumping directly into the Connecticut River, but all of the streams in that area eventually end up in the Connecticut River, the tributaries.

We made an agreement with the City of Springfield for "X" number of dollars -- which was too much, but nevertheless we did it. We get all set to go, and we come to find out that there is no legislation allowing any community to pay from bonded money another city for a connection fee. Our project had to wait two years because of this, because we had to go to our General Court with a special act to allow us to pay the City of Springfield the connection fee.

I think that this gets rather cumbersome, and I think that perhaps some legislation could be drawn to allow something like this.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I think you've got some very effective representatives who I see in this hall. I will let them respond at another time.

We will try to now wind up, if we can, and then we will get into the Westover situation, but I don't want to deny anybody who wants to make a comment or make some observation.

MR. KING: My name is F. H. King, and I am the Manager of Gas & Electric in Holyoke.

First, I would like to commend you and your staff on setting up this meeting. I think there is a big need for this timely information, and we can't afford to lose any more industry in this area.

I have two brief questions. First, I understand that if the industry makes a joint application with a municipality, they also would be eligible for the Federal funds?

MR. STEIN: No. Only municipalities can make applications, but the municipal plant can treat both industrial and municipal wastes.

We can only make a grant to a bona fide municipality. Only municipalities can make applications. The arrangement must be made, if you are going to include that industry, on a local level between the industry and the municipality. As far as the Federal Government or the State in the program is concerned, the municipality must make the application.

MR. KING: Do I understand that there is a limit

set for thermal pollution, and, if not, what is the status of that?

MR. McMAHON: Yes. As part of our criteria on thermal pollution, if I can reconstruct it correctly, it says, "None, except those increases that will not affect any of the most extensive governing water use, or in no case more than 83 degrees for a warm water fishery, more than 68 degrees for a cold water fishery, and in no case more than 4 degrees Fahrenheit.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I would just like to say this as a final comment.

I know that Mayor Demers has commented on the problems that any community has in going to the respective agencies, and maybe you would just like to review this very briefly, because it is something we all understand and I think all of us ought to be reminded about, and something that those of us who are interested in efficiency in government are greatly concerned about.

Maybe Mayor Demers would make just a brief comment on the problems that they have had in doing this, going through the various agencies, and then we will wind this session up.

MAYOR DEMERS: Thank you, Senator.

I just don't want everybody to think that Chicopee was more or less the fair-haired child in the particular

problem of pollution.

In 1966, we were pointed out by the Department of Public Health as being the prime polluter of the Connecticut River, so we were aware that there was $1,200,000 of Public Law 660 funds available to us, but it was our feeling that we should have more participation by the Federal agencies.

Consequently, when we went back to HUD to see if we could get more help, we were told that there was just a certain amount of funds that were available, $100 million, and we were also told that the City of Chicopee alone had applied for over $150 million in a grant, so therefore we knew that our chances weren't too good there.

Consequently, we looked around another area to see where we could possibly attempt to get some monies, and we found that in the Economic Development Administration there was money set aside for pollution control and abatement, providing we could prove that we were saving jobs in the area.

We had to go ahead and prepare, I would say, mountains of applications. We had considerable difficulties in Washington, because these people told us that we would have to go to the different employers and find out whether they are going to move out, or are they going to expand.

When we went back to our different manufacturers in Chicopee, they didn't want to give us this information, because I think most of them felt it was their own privileged information.

So we would go back to Washington, and they would say to us, "Well, we always have difficulty with people from New England in that sense of the word," but then I found out this fellow was from Iowa.

I said, "Well, maybe we've got something better up here in New England. Maybe that's why we like to give you a little more difficulty."

But we were very fortunate to be able to prove our case in Chicopee, and we did receive a grant last year of $823,000 from the Economic Development Administration, which comprised 20 per cent more.

As you all know, the Water Pollution Control Act, being passed by the Legislature for $150,000,000, has not been fully enacted. However, we have been reasonably assured by the Director, by the President of the Senate Donahue, and by the head of the Ways and Means Committee of the Senate, because Act 5076 has been passed by the House and now all it needs is its final enactment by the Senate, and Senator Burke, who is the head of the Ways and Means Committee, has said that there is no fault that he

finds with the act as far as its application to the City of Chicopee.

I just want to say, gentlemen, I think we are all looking for that 80 per cent, and I don't think that we should proceed without it, but I do agree with Mr. Stein there that you've got to show that you want to move ahead yourself too.

I think that we have faced many problems in Chicopee. I know that we drove Mr. Bayon to more white hairs on his head than he had previously, but this is the only way that we got it. We kept pestering him and kept moving in there and kept sending in letters and applications over and over again, and finally it did come through, so that we broke ground this morning, I am very happy to say, and the Senator was there with us this morning, along with Tom and all the others who are very vitally interested in this water pollution control.

But, if I can add this, I think we should try and obtain all the State and Federal aid that we possibly can get, but I think it is up to us as communities and as industries to keep the pressure out there, because I think if we put the pressure on these people, then they have something to fight with.

That's all I would like to add. Thank you.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

Wrapping this part of it up, I would like to just ask Mr. Peloquin, who is the Executive Secretary of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, if he would like to make any very brief comment on what he has heard this afternoon.

The New England Regional Commission was established. We are trying to meet these problems on a regional kind of basis.

I don't know whether there is any comment that you would like to make on this. The area of water pollution is one of the areas of primary interest among the New England Governors. If you would like to make any comment, we would be delighted to hear you. We will leave this up to you.

MR. PELOQUIN: Thank you very much, Senator.

I am delighted to be here on behalf of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission. One of my activities is to coordinate the water pollution control activities for all interstate waters in New England and the eastern part of New York State, and this has given me a very good picture of what is happening in the Connecticut River Basin.

Definitely, what happens in this area has an

interstate impact and does affect the waters of Connecticut. From that standpoint, I feel that from what I have heard this afternoon, much progress has been made, and that the program is really beginning to roll, and we will be seeing clean waters in the Connecticut River before too long.

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

I would just like to say that one of the things that is extremely distressing to me is the extraordinary lag in time in the planning grants proposal. I think the fact that this is 16 to 18 months is just absolutely too long -- absolutely too long -- and the comments that have been made here on this are valid. You have challenged these gentlemen, and I am going to return to Washington and just see if we cannot, in conversations with the respective Secretaries, see what can be done to reduce this.

There is absolutely no reason in the world why there cannot be a short period of time. There is absolutely none, and I think this point is well taken and is a matter of concern to all of us.

We would like to move over into the Westover situation. Why don't we take a three minute stretch, and then we'll get started on that and just see where we are.

All right.

(After a short recess.)

SENATOR KENNEDY: Could we come to order, please?

One of the points which has aroused considerable interest is the situation here in Westover.

I will ask Mr. Stein if he would explain the reasons why Westover is on the Interior list, and also ask for some comment from the State Department as well, and then we will ask the respective colonels if they would be kind enough to make some kind of comment, and then we will move from there.

Mr. Stein?

MR. STEIN: Yes. I will call on Mr. Klashman for the details.

I would like to point out that we always say this as a disclaimer. Given the total pollution problem in the Connecticut River Valley, the kind of pollution you are getting from the Federal installation in Westover some people might classify as minor, but we do not believe, and I think this is a policy of Government, that we can come to anyone else and ask you to clean up unless our own house is in order.

We have had tremendous cooperation from the Department of Defense and the Air Force in particular. We have been successful in working out pollution control

problems with them on a case by case basis. We know that they will stand with us ready to show the way to a cleaner Connecticut River.

Mr. Klashman.

MR. KLASHMAN: First, I would like to say that the reason that the Westover Air Force Base was placed on our list for non-compliance was 2-fold.

First, as a result of the first session of the conference, this installation, along with all the other installations, was supposed to put in chlorination full time. The Base has not done that, but I understand that they will be doing so. They are doing chloriration part-time.

In addition to that, we have an Executive Order 11288 which calls for secondary treatment of all Federal installations and chlorination.

The situation at Chicopee is that it is their intention and they actually have an agreement to tie in with Chicopee at the time that Chicopee's interceptors get to them.

We have the same situation with industry. An industry is polluting a stream and indicates that when the time comes that the municipality near them is able to take care of them, they will do something about it. But we don't feel that we can treat our own installations any differently

than we would an industry, and therefore the Base was not in compliance because they are not meeting the Executive Order until such time as this waste is not going in.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Is there any comment?

MR. McMAHON: Not at this time.

SENATOR KENNEDY: All right. We have Colonel Sousley here, and I understand you have some colleagues with you as well, if you would like to introduce your colleagues.

COLONEL SOUSLEY: I would like to introduce Colonel Fielder, who is Director of Civil Engineering at Westover Air Force Base, and Colonel Covell, who is Director of Information for the 8th Air Force.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Colonel, you are welcome to come up here, if that would be easier for you, and we can give you a drop of water.

COLONEL SOUSLEY: When I assumed command of Westover Air Force Base as the Base Commander, shortly thereafter this problem was presented, and I have a memo for the record which I would like to quote from, which was prepared from a very lengthy and detailed study that has been conducted by many agencies of the situation at Westover.

Sometime along about the end of 1960 or 1961, the Massachusetts Department of Public Health directed the requirements on all users of the Chicopee River that they

utilize secondary treatment on their sewage.

Westover had had a primary plant in being since 1941. This primary sewage treatment plant utilizes the Imhoff treatment tanks. After it comes out of this plant, then the effluent which is cleansed in this process flows through approximately a 16-inch line with various manholes from the Base plant into the Chicopee.

Westover Air Force Base accordingly took action locally in 1961 to program for a secondary treatment plant in the subsequent military construction program.

Right now we are looking at programs for 1970 and 1971, because they are pretty well firmed up for the periods of 1968 and 1969, for what we know that we need.

Prior to taking the necessary programming action in 1961, Westover contacted the Commonwealth of Massachusetts officials to assure that the proposed plant would also meet the State requirements. At this time, in response to Westover's request, the Commonwealth suggested that since the City of Chicopee was also planning a treatment facility, that Westover should consider tying in with the City of Chicopee.

The Base then took appropriate action through Headquarters 8th Air Force, which is our immediate chain of command, and the headquarters located here on Westover Air

Force Base, Strategic Air Command, which is our higher headquarters between us and the USAF. An agreement was reached at all levels, and a contract between the United States Air Force and the City of Chicopee was approved by the Air Force Logistic Command on 5 December 1962, and manually delivered to the city on 21 December 1962.

The provisions of this agreement are that the U. S. Air Force will furnish $218,000 as a connection fee, and subsequently pay a monthly service charge for use of the facilities, the one that we broke ground on this morning.

This will take place, as I understand it, in three phases:

The ground-breaking and the construction to be completed in early 1969 -- that is the latest date I have.

Phase 2 would be to construct the interceptor line from the Chicopee plant to Westover Air Force Base, and simultaneously connect with the Westover plant. At this time, our Westover primary plant that we have there will go on a stand-by basis.

Therefore, as a result of this, Westover is contractually bound to the City of Chicopee for treatment of its sewage. Until such time as appropriate facilities, including the connections to Westover, are constructed by the city, we cannot apparently take any further action.

In view of the austerity of the funds and the long lead-time, which I mentioned earlier, thereby meaning 1971, 1972 or even 1973 before we could possibly get a secondary plant approved in the military construction program and into being, we feel that this solution and this contractual agreement is our best course of action to follow.

MR. STEIN: Colonel, may I ask you a question?

What is your prognosis of when you are going to hook up to Chicopee under the present program? When can we expect a hook-up?

COLONEL SOUSLEY: Immediately upon completion.

MR. STEIN: I know, but when is that going to be completed? What time do you expect that it is going to occur? How long will that be?

COLONEL FIELDER: We are scheduled to tie in our portion of the interconnect in January of 1969. However, the timetable for the complete project, as I understand it, will not be completed until April.

That is as it stands now. I am sure the people from Chicopee can correct me if I am wrong.

MR. STEIN: In other words, we can expect a hook-up and your sewage will be flowing into the Chicopee system by April 1969?

COLONEL FIELDER: Yes, sir, that is as I see it.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Will you ask about chlorination?

MR. STEIN: Are you chlorinating in your plant now?

COLONEL SOUSLEY: We have chlorinated, sir.

MR. STEIN: Full time?

COLONEL SOUSLEY: No, sir.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Can we have the full time chlorination? Isn't that one of the things, Mr. Stein?

MR. STEIN: Yes. I think that was one of the requirements we asked for, year-round chlorination.

May we know why that isn't being done?

COLONEL FIELDER: Yes, sir. We have to go to Strategic Air Command Headquarters to get permission for chlorination.

This item you have mentioned is brand new to me. We have done it in the past, and we have been asked by the health officials and the City of Chicopee when the odor got pretty bad and the water got low in the river, and we have done it.

MR. STEIN: We are not interested in chlorination so much for other controls as for the control of bacteria in the effluent.

COLONEL FIELDER: I can't give you an answer

right now. All I know is we must go to Headquarters.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Have you requested that authorization from SAC Headquarters?

COLONEL FIELDER: I have not, no, sir.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Will it be possible for that request to come in?

COLONEL FIELDER: Yes, sir.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Do you want to request it? Can we request it? Can a Senator request it as well as a Mayor?

COLONEL FIELDER: Yes, sir.

COLONEL SOUSLEY: As the Colonel mentions, this is the first time that full time chlorination has been brought to my attention. This is the first time. I have gone through the documents, and if it is in the documents that I have anywhere in writing, I have missed it, but I am not aware of this requirement having been levied.

As he said, we have occasionally, when the river was low, been asked to chlorinate.

MR. STEIN: This does not seem to me an insurmountable problem, because if you have done it on an interim basis, you have the chlorination facilities. All you need now is the chlorine, and doing it.

COLONEL SOUSLEY: I fully agree, if that is the

solution. But, as I say, this is the first time I have heard it.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Before you leave, may I say this: They have outlined their program now of compliance, and they have also indicated a willingness to make the request for chlorination, as far as going ahead and doing the full time chlorination.

As far as you are concerned, then, they are doing everything that can possibly be done, just so that we have this record established? There is nothing really in addition that we can expect of them until the time that the interconnection takes place?

MR. STEIN: Anything else would be unreasonable, yes.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Would be unreasonable, so at the time we do have the full chlorination, as far as you are concerned and, if I am correct, as far as the State is concerned, we will have as full compliance as we can expect, and that is really what we are aiming for.

MR. STEIN: Yes.

COLONEL SOUSLEY: I assure you we will do everything in our power to do that.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I want to thank the Colonel and thank you gentlemen for your willingness and your interest

in attending to this problem.

I think all of us are interested in getting the job done, and we are all trying to work this out together. That is really the function and the purpose of the workshop, so that is really what we want.

I will say that I have contacted Secretary McNamara and he has indicated that he is going to respond, but I will certainly, as a result of this meeting, write him a communication and bring him up to date as to what Mr. Stein has said, and also what you said, Colonel, and get his information as well, and make you aware of his information.

MR. BAYON: Senator, can I ask, for the record -- the implementation schedule which was issued by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and which has been approved by the Department of the Interior calls for connecting Westover Air Force Base into the city system in January 1969, so that there is absolutely no violation at the present time under the existing law, under the existing implementation schedule, and that this will be accomplished on the basis of our present status in the Chicopee construction.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Well, I stand to correct you, because, as I understand, Mr. Stein says there isn't chlorination going on now. Mr. Stein can make the comment on that.

MR. STEIN: Yes. Except for chlorination, we are not considering that a violation, and that you are moving ahead.

What we would hope is that during this interim period, we get chlorination of the Westover Air Force Base. I think we have come as close to resolving that as we possibly can, and, as usual, we have always had the full cooperation of the Air Force.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Fine. Thank you very much, Colonel. We appreciate your appearance here, and also the comments.

MR. GRIMALDI: I am James Grimaldi. May I?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Yes, Mr. Grimaldi.

MR. GRIMALDI: Senator, I am here today as a Representative from the 6th Hampden District, and I want to congratulate the Senator for the workshop he is conducting here. I am sure the citizens of Springfield and our good Congressman Bowler is as interested as we are here today.

I like to think that the Connecticut River should get some attention, and I am hopeful that it will, but this is where we start, in a workshop such as this.

I know the Connecticut River needs some consideration. I am sure that with the good Senator and the Congressmen from this area, they will help us do the job that we have

to have done.

I am also convinced that the citizens in the City of Springfield would like to see this river cleaned up. This would be a great asset to our community, and I am convinced that with the help of the State and Federal Government, this will be an eventuality.

The sooner the better, Senator, and I thank you for the workshop that you are conducting here. Thank you very much.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Mr. Grimaldi. We appreciate your comments and your interest and your attendance.

There have been a number of individuals, as well as organizations, that wanted to make comments, and I think that would be in order at this time. There have been a number who have communicated with me and have been notified of this meeting, and we would welcome their comments.

If there is someone who, for a particular reason, did not get a chance to speak at the earlier time, I think it will be appropriate for him to do so now. We want to give everyone a chance, any of the industries or the towns, while we have these gentlemen here, to have the floor.

MR. O'CONNOR: I'm Walter O'Connor from Agawam, Massachusetts. I am a user of the Connecticut River, not

only in the Springfield area, but in its entire length, and I would like to ask a question.

Is there anybody in this room that actually believes that the sewage treatment plants are doing what they are supposed to do?

MR. STEIN: What you raise is one of the most significant problems we have. You are not going to have a clean river if you don't have both the facilities designed to do the job and being operated correctly.

This is a problem that the people not only on the Connecticut River but all over the country are going to have to face up to. I think the best analogy we can give you here is to compare a waste treatment facility to some kind of utility, such as a water and electric utility.

This electric utility you have here is not much good if on a dark day the week before Christmas, when you are in your office and you flip your lights on, and all the ladies are at home with their lights on and putting their appliances on and they turn the switch, if the electric juice doesn't come out, and you are paying all year round for standby equipment to do that job.

The thing you have to remember is when you have a breakdown, it is something like your electric utility, your telephone utility, your gas utility or your water

system, you have built-in consumer complaints to call that to your attention.

That blackout in New York is an excellent example of what the reaction is when you have a failure. The problem is when we do have a failure in a waste treatment facility and are pouring wastes into the river, who knows it? Maybe the fish or the plankton, or you or we.

The point is, I think, if we are talking about a program, that all the facilities and the best designed facilities in the world are going to be no better than monuments for water pollution unless they are operated properly, and operated properly not just two months or a month during the year during warm weather, but 365 days a year, and I think this is an aspect of the program that we all have to get with.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you.

I know there are perhaps some representatives of the conservation groups and others who would like to make comments.

Something has come up which I think would be of interest to all of those who are concerned about the problem, and that is what the New England Regional Commission is doing on this question. That is, they are trying to develop a school to help train people that will be working

in this area and field, and I might ask Mr. Peloquin if he would make some comment on that, because I think that would be of interest to all of us.

MR. PELOQUIN: Thank you, Senator.

I cannot overemphasize Mr. Stein's comments on the proper operation of the waste treatment plant. It makes no difference how good a plant you have built; if it is not operated properly it will not do the job.

The New England Interstate Commission recognizes this problem, and we are in the process now of developing an operator training program, which will be a 2-phased operation. The first phase will be short term training courses to improve the efficiency of the individual now working as a plant operator, and to also upgrade his capabilities to move into secondary plants from the primary plants they may be in now, and to recognize the problems before they develop so that they can forestall any miscalculation or misoperation within the plant.

The second phase of the program is going to be a long-range operating program, possibly operating on a 9-month basis, similar to an academic year basis, to train people to take over the operation of the treatment plants which will be constructed under the proposed implementation plans submitted by all six New England States and New York.

We are in the process of developing course schedules and working with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in establishing this program. We have set a target date for the long-range program of September 1968. We hope to start the short term courses, which will be possibly of one or two weeks' duration, sometime during the period, January 1st to April 1st, 1968.

For the people here connected with municipalities, I would urge you to consider very seriously providing funds to permit your people to attend these courses, because this is one major factor in the proper operation of your plants.

The Commission has authorized the Executive Committee and myself to negotiate with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to locate this school at the Broad Bay Palmer State Park at Ipswich, and these negotiations are underway at the present time. There are certain conditions which will have to be met, and I hope that in the very near future we will be in a position to provide the general public with much more information than I can at the present time.

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much. Is Mr.

Marceau here from the Izaak Walton League?

MR. MARCEAU: May I come up here?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MR.MARCEAU: I'm Buddy Marceau, President of the Paocautuch Chapter of the Izaak Walton League, and also President of the Massachusetts Division of the Izaak Walton League of America.

I wear a 40-year pin. For 42 years, the Izaak Walton League has been yelling "Pollution abatement."

And I want to compliment you, Senator Edward. Your voice has been raised louder today than ours has been during our entire forty years of operation. You have brought more to light on the question and the problems of pollution abatement in Massachusetts to the forefront. You haven't been afraid to name industries. You haven't been afraid to name towns and cities that are delinquent.

We were muzzled, and thanks to you, we have now taken off the muzzle and are going over onto pollution.

Thank you.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Marceau.

Are there any other comments?

MR. BLAIS: I'm Adrian Blais, Pollution Chairman of the Council of Sportsmen's Clubs of Hampden County.

For the last 45 years, I have been doing pollution

work for the Council, and in conjunction with the Izaak Walton League also, and I always call the 32 clubs involved as my committee, because they are the ones that pinpoint the pollution problems, and I look them up and do whatever I can with the Department of Public Health, and try and get them straightened out.

We have been picking on the Department of Health for years with fairly good results. The big battle-cry all the time is "What can we do about it? We have no money," which is universal, I guess, but I can assure you, with what I have heard here today and in the last workshop in Amherst, that we will keep picking at the Department of Public Health and clean up as much pollution as possible, and probably help out a great deal in your program.

We thank you, Senator Kennedy, for helping us out and all the others involved also.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

MR. WARREN: My name is Ken Warren, and one question I would like to ask is this: Through our Public Health Department, we had a very heavy pollution of the Connecticut River watershed closed up practically by this person, and a Government loan was given to the man to start his operation again, and he finally cleaned up, and it was finally polluted again. That is on the east branch of the

Westfield River.

We have been hollering to clean up the Connecticut River and its tributaries. I don't think we are making headway if the Federal Government turns around and closes its fists in one way and opens its hands in another way.

The place I am talking about is the Precision Mill in East Bancroft, Massachusetts. It was closed down. Then the Federal Government turned around and gave a small business loan to the new owner. He in turn went into operation, and now we have pollution that extends all the way from the top of the Birches to the Connecticut River.

We don't think it is fair when you do one thing, and turn around and another agency will counteract the efforts of the first one.

MR. KLASHMAN: Senator Kennedy, this is an interesting point that he has raised. In the case of the EDA loans, we in our Department have to review the applications to make sure that it is not going to cause any water pollution control problem.

This is the first time that I have run into this with the Small Business Administration. I am not familiar with the situation. We will look into it, but it might be that this should also cover the Small Business Administration too.

SENATOR KENNEDY: It certainly would appear to me that it should. I think the point is well raised, and we will find out about that particular instance. I think the point is very worthwhile.

Do you have the name of the company, sir?

MR. WARREN: Berkshire Tissue Mill.

MR. WADE: It is the Parkhill Corporation.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Parkhill Corporation?

MR. WADE: That's right. It is on the west branch of the Westfield River.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I don't know why I didn't know that (laughter).

Well, gentlemen, I don't know if there are any additional comments that any of our friends up here at the table would like to make, or from the floor.

If there are not, let me first thank all of you who have come here today, the representatives of the cities and towns that are here, the members of the Boards of Selectmen, the representatives of industry who have appeared here, and, as Mr. Stein mentioned to me, he said that in this area the industries themselves are really working towards compliance.

What we need is the same kind of initiative which has been provided by some of our different communities

in meeting these problems for compliance.

I want to again reiterate my willingness and interest in doing anything and everything we possibly can to perfect the various applications that do come down to the respective agencies on these programs, and to try and work with any of you who have programs to find out if there isn't a dollar under one program, maybe there is under another, and see what can be usefully worked out.

We have people who want to help you in my office. I know that Congressman Boland does as well. We all want to see this job tackled and work together.

I want to commend you for your interest. I want to thank the distinguished State officials who are here, and the regional officials who were kind enough to come, Mr. Klashman, Murray Stein, and all the others who are embarked on this program.

We have hopes of having these kinds of meetings in other parts of the State for other communities, to try and give them an opportunity as well to explore the possibilities, and to draw from them at least some of the problems that they face and are confronted with, so that we can work a better and more effective kind of program to help all of you and to help our State.

Mr. Stein travels all over the country and has

the principal responsibility for rivers all over our Nation, and he has shown a great interest and a concern for the problems that we have in Massachusetts, and we are delighted.

If any of the communities or any of the industries feel that for some reason they are not fairly treated, or, for one reason or another, they feel that the decisions which are made are unfair or unjust or arbitrary, I hope they will get in touch with me as well, so that we can try and make sure that any of these kinds of adjustments are fully in accord with the facts. I want to emphasize that point.

As I mentioned earlier, I am going to ask the Secretary to publish an addendum to the program that has been placed in effect now, so that we will have up to date information on what the cities and towns are doing, the ones that are making the plans and the programs, the businesses and industries that are attempting to comply, so that it is a matter of record what the industries are doing in the western part of Massachusetts. I think this will be very helpful. I think it is helpful for the various communities, and I think it is also helpful to show other States what we can do.

I want to personally express my appreciation to those who have come and helped in all different ways to make this possible. I think that this will be a continuing quest

for all of us.

We have had spokesmen here who talked about working on it for 42 years. Certainly, there are many of us who have been involved with this for a shorter period of time, and we hope our efforts will not have to go on for 46 years, but we are prepared to continue those efforts for any time that is necessary to achieve something, which I think all of us want to see, and that is, the Connecticut River, the Chicopee and the Westfield River in the kind and state of nature which all of us have read about in Thoreau's description of the Massachusetts waters.

That is something which we want to leave to a future generation, and is something which I think is within the possibility of those people who are here and the representatives of the people who are here.

I want to thank you all very much. I want to thank the Colonel and the representatives of Westover, and the representatives of the press who have been interested and who have been working with all of us on these problems so that the people will understand where we are, and I want to thank the members of the radio and television as well. I thank the State Representatives and Senators who are here, the Mayors of the respective communities and towns for their interest in coming. I thank all of you, and I look forward to working with you in the future. We are adjourned.

(At 3:45 p.m., an adjournment was taken.)

GPO 935-500